



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,075	02/06/2004	Daniel R. Fulwiler	90973.000017	7136
23387	7590	09/09/2005	EXAMINER	
Stephen B. Salai, Esq. Harter, Secrest & Emery LLP 1600 Bausch & Lomb Place Rochester, NY 14604-2711				AHMAD, NASSER
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1772		

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/774,075	FULWILER, DANIEL R.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Nasser Ahmad	1772		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

WHENEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION:

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-16 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 17-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/1/04
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-9 and 17-20, drawn to a labeling system, classified in class 428, subclass 40.1.
 - II. Claims 10-16 and 21, drawn to a method of labelling, classified in class 156, subclass 250.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions Group I and Group II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process comprising assembling discrete pieces of plies together, instead of the cutting step, and applying it to an inside of a film wrap.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Thomas B. Ryan on August 24, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-9 and 17-20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying

to this Office action. Claims 10-16 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, as stated, is found to be confusing. It is unclear as to if the claim is directed to an article comprising the barrier film with the label mounted thereon or are the barrier film and the label separate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mize (5330777).

Mize relates to a labeled packaging system comprising a multi-ply barrier covering film (10) having inner and outer plies (figures 6 and 7) that are separately removable (col. 5, lines 5-11) and a label (16) adhered to the inner ply of the barrier film (figure-6). The

label comprises a first area supporting a print layer and at least a partially surrounding area supporting an adhesive layer (col. 7, lines 29-34). The label can have multiple layers such as paper with a waterproof coating (col. 7, lines 29-34). As shown in figure-6, the barrier film is wrapped around the product with the label being positioned between the barrier film and the product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 1-4, 8-9 and 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mize in view of Witkowski (5676401).

Mize, as discussed above, fails to teach that the print layer area of the label avoid the presence of adhesive patterned layer. Witkowski discloses a label (44) comprising print layer area 9550 and adhesive layer areas (53,53) which avoids the print area (figure-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to utilize Witkowski's teaching of using a label with adhesive areas being different from the print area in the invention of Mize with the motivation to provide for increased adhesion between the label adhesive area and the surface to which it is attached.

Further, in view of above discussed 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection, examiner has taken the position that the claim 1 comprises separate barrier film and

label. Thus, Mize teaches a barrier film having inner and outer plies, and a label having two plies. However, Mize fails to teach that the label has adhesive extending beyond the print layer. Witkowski discloses a label having adhesive layer extending beyond the print layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to utilize the teaching of Witkowski by providing the label in the barrier film containing packaging system of Mize with the motivation to provide a system for labeling a product while protecting the label from getting damaged.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art uncovered so far fails to teach a product labeling system incorporated into a product comprising a first ply of the label is a liner backing, that the second ply is a facestock, or that the liner supports a release coating adjacent the adhesive layer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nasser Ahmad whose telephone number is 571-272-1487. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM, and on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nasser Ahmad 9/6/05
Nasser Ahmad
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772

N. Ahmad.
September 6, 2005.